



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed particular amendments to the claims to clarify the distinction between the claimed subject matter and the Ostrowski reference in light of applicant's arguments. Also, the examiner proposed cancellation of particular dependent claims as such were directed to subject matter already defined in claim 1. The examiner suggested particular amendments to claim 1 to make clear that the support frame is a part of the wiper drive. Also set forth in claim 1 was that the at least one stop is of unitary, one piece construction with the detachable add-on element and that the tubular element is secured within the housing by the tube retaining section of the detachable add-on element or that the tubular element is secured by clamping between the housing and tube retaining section. The later being presented in a new claim 23 conforming to claim 1 save for this difference. Such particular structure with relation to the tubular element does not appear fairly taught by the art of record. See the Examiner's Amendment.